

### REMARKS

In response to the Official Action mailed on May 10, 2004, Applicants have submitted an Abstract and have amended claims 1-3 to place the claims in better grammatical form for US practice and have submitted new claims 4-12 for consideration by the Examiner.

In the Official Action, reference is made to "Claims 1-52" although the application has heretofore always included only claims 1-3. Accordingly, Applicants understand the references in the Official Action to refer to the pending claims 1-3.

Regarding the comments made concerning the listing of references in the specification, Applicants are submitting an Information Disclosure Statement herewith to make the patent documents of record. However, some of the patent documents are not currently available and so Applicants will submit copies of those additional patent documents for consideration by the Examiner upon receipt.

Regarding the comments concerning the Abstract, Applicants note that the application as filed included an Abstract on the first page. However, as requested by the Examiner, Applicants have provided a new Abstract on a separate sheet in accordance with US practice.

In the Official Action, the claims were rejected under 35 USC § 112, first paragraph as failing to comply with the written description requirement. Applicants submit that the claimed invention is adequately disclosed so as to enable one skilled in the art to understand how to make and use the invention. Moreover, Applicants further note that the corresponding application has been allowed to issue in the European Patent Office with the original claims and with the original specification. (A copy of EP 1 084 288 B1 is enclosed herewith.) In addition, the corresponding

application has been allowed to issue in Australia with the original claims and with the original specification. (A copy of AU 199873303 B2 is enclosed herewith.)

Therefore, both the Australian and European patent offices have found the original claims to have been adequately described by the present specification and

Applicants submit that the rejection under 35 USC § 112, first paragraph should be withdrawn.

In addition, Applicants note that the Examiner's questions concerning how the perpendicular stratification of the planary fibrous shapes/webs is accomplished is not necessary for an understanding of the "claimed" invention. Instead, the mechanical arrangement of the first and second elements along with the coupling of the first and second elements to the driving mechanism is more than adequately disclosed in the drawings and specification. It is only necessary for one skilled in the art to understand that the first and second elements make synchronous and reciprocating motions and are provided for "perpendicular stratification of planary fibrous shapes".

With regard to the prior art made of record, Applicants submit that such prior art is not particularly pertinent to the present invention and do not pertain to the perpendicular stratification of planary fibrous shapes. Instead, the patent documents pertain to devices for making pile fabrics.


A prompt and favorable reconsideration of the present application along with a consideration of newly presented claims 4-12 is earnestly solicited.

Respectfully submitted,

BURNS, DOANE, SWECKER & MATHIS, L.L.P.

Date: August 10, 2004

By: \_\_\_\_\_

  
George A. Hovanec, Jr.  
Registration No. 28223

P.O. Box 1404  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1404  
(703) 836-6620